IHS

Dear Mother Theresa:

Pax Christi!

I am most grateful to you for your answer and would like to first of all assure you that I am aware of your great love for me and your desire that I be all for Jesus. I hope that you will accept the fact that I also bear for you a similar love and desire.

I would like you to consider your words which I quote:

> "Ask yourself, do I believe? If you do believe then do not waste time on useless arguments and questioning. For they are all useless if you believe..."

Yes Mother, I believe, but your question forgets to add an important word - What is it that I do believe? I believe in "ONE HOLY CATHOLIC AND APOSTOLIC CHURCH." I do not believe that the New Church - the "Post-conciliar" Church, the Church of Paul VI, and the Church that it would appear you are in, is any of these.

It is not ONE for it has separated itself from the Church of All Times. It may have unity with itself, with Paul VI, and it may even acheive unity with the Anglicans and the Lutherans. But unless it teaches all the truths (not just those declared de fide definita) and uses all the rites (fixed by decrees of the Ecumenical Councils) it will have no unity with that Church that Christ founded and against which the gates of Hell shall not prevail. It is not HOLY for it has attacked and changed the most holy thing that Christ has given us, His Holy Mass. However sacred some of its other actions may be (the Protestants also perform some sacred functions), this one act alone deprives the New Church of any right to this title. It is not APOSTOLIC because it has departed from Apostolic custom and Apostolic teaching. Its claim to be Apostolic because it retains some of the Apostolic teachings and customs (not all) is paralleled by similar claims on the part of many Protestant sects. Finally, if for no other reasons than those given above, it is not CATHOLIC. This is a tremendous accusation to lay against the New Church, but it is one I have substantiated and one your respondant has not in any way disproved.

Our correspondance is neither a "waste of time," nor "useless." This I state for two reasons: First, it has a tremendous pertinence to my family; and Second, I know of no publication in which the issues that divide the New from the traditional Church are seriously "debated." Let us consider each of these issues.

With regard to the first point, let me remind you that it was you who initiated this discussion. When my wife informed you that I was attending the traditional Mass and insisting that my children do so also, it was you who wrote and told her to do everything in her power to prevent this. I doing so, you clearly interfered with my legitimate rights as a Catholic father - indeed, with my obligations as the head of a family. There is nothing - absolutely nothing, un-Catholic about attending the traditional rites of the traditional Church. Within my family I have a similar authority in such matters to that of the Pope within the Church. My family is after all a microcosmic reflection of the Church. Admittedly, this authority has limitations, for I, within my family, and he, within the Church, cannot command those under our authority to do anything that is sinful or against the Law of God. I cannot for instance demand that my family attend a Lutheran service. We also have parallel "obligations," his to protect and teach the entire "deposit of the Faith," and mine, to be sure that my children are brought up and taught this same Faith. Because of the influence you have over my wife (in general, of course, an excellent influence), she has obeyed you and disobeyed me. There is thus dividion and REBELLION in my family. Now, my wife owes me obedience in this area (we were married by the rites of the

traditional Church - I am aware that in the New Church the reference to obedience is no longer obligatory). As I have said above, this obedience does not extend to matters that are sinful. It was for this reason that when you said "We owe complete obedience to the Pope," that I took issue with you and showed you with five pages of quotes taken from authorities in the traditional Church that this was NOT A CATHOLIC teaching. The Pope has clearly exceeded his authority in both changing the Mass and in commanding that the faithful not attend the traditional Mass. There can be therefore, no sin whatsoever in my wife obeying me on this issue.

It would have been perfectly within my right to even use moderate force to make my wife obey on this issue. If my wife had for instance become a Lutheran or a Baptist, and was influencing my children to leave the True Faith, I could even demand that she leave my home. (On the Pope's part, this would be called "excommunication.") Now, it was out of respect for you and her that I have done otherwise. In attempting to show you where you are wrong, I have been and am, fighting for the souls of my wife and children. By allowing my children to continue to go to the New Church with its dubious sacraments, and by allowing their souls to be formed by the teachings heard during these services, I not only risk their leaving the Faith - I even risk their rejecting all religion. You cannot deny this statement for you yourself know how many children of your friends have left the Church, and you have on more than one occassion warned us to select carefully which priests say "mass". In my Church - the Church of All Times, it is never necessary to select one's priests with care. They all teach the same doctrine and they all say the same Mass, a Mass about which no one has raised any doubts. I do not know whether I shall succeed in keeping my children within the faith. But this I do know; they do not like the New Church with its guitars and its all too human priests; and they do know that the Catholic religion is not the religion they are being exposed to. I doubt if they will be among the seven million children of Catholic parents that no longer identify themselves with the Catholic Church that the Boystown report describes. (All this is not to imply the absence of the Grace of God or personal prayer on their behalf.)

Now, please understand, I am not saying that everything is bad in the New Church, for like many of the Protestant sects, it still retains some Catholic elements. My complaint against it is quite specific. It is not Catholic.

The second point relates to the publishing of this discussion. I know of no publication that has clearly aligned the two positions in this manner. I think it important that you realize that your respondant is speaking in your name. This is all the more true in so far as I do not even know his name. When he makes a statement that "only a teaching which the Church has defined as being part of God's revealed truth cannot be changed," he is committing you to these words. Do you believe that there are certain truths that God has revealed, and which the Church has taught since Apostolic times, but that have not as yet been defined and can therefore be changed? I doubt it, for such is not the teaching of the Church. Do you believe that the Church can change its teaching about "personal judgment after death?" Again I doubt it. But your respondant does! Even more, you are a representative of the New Church, and one of its finest representatives. In so far as this "debate" is with you, it is an "official" debate with the New Church. I think it therefore important that you at least read carefully the issues discussed, for these opinions will be imputed to you. I have no objection whatever to the fact that another has spoken on your behalf, but if he rejects the teaching of the Syllabus of Errors, and of the Encyclical Mortalium Animos, which he clearly does, then you also reject them. I say all this because I have no desire to see you embarrased at some future time. I would further remind you that in my first letter to you I specified that, regardless of the outcome, I intended to publish this correspondence.

Before going further, let me thank you for the prayer to Our Lady that you

have sent and which I can most full-heartedly say and will. For, as Meister Eckhart said, "It is more worth to God His being brought forth ghostly in the individual virgin or good soul than that He be born of Mary bodily," and as Saint Louis de Montfort said, "the more the Holy Spirit... finds Mary, His dear and inseparable spouse in any soul, the more active and mighty He becomes in producing Jesus Christ in that soul." As St. Ambrose said:

> "Let the soul of Mary be in each of us to magnify the Lord,
> Let the spirit of Mary be in each of us to rejoice in God."

But let us both remember that prayer, however necessary, does not remove from us the obligation of adhering to the Truth with all our hearts and all our souls, and all our minds and all our strength.

I agree with you that our correspondence has come to the point of "endless discussion," and should perhaps be terminated. I shall of course answer any further issues that your respondant raises. We have both however had ample opportunity to express our views and to quote our sources. Whatever side of the "debate" we align ourselves with, it has been amply demonstrated that the New Church - the "Post-conciliar" Church and the traditional Church - or the Church of All Times, are different churches, with different teachings and different rites. I am only in the Church for one reason - to love, honor and serve God and to sanctify my soul. This being so, I cannot but choose that Church which manifests all the signs that Christ gave us with which to discerne His Church - UNITY, HOLYNESS, APOSTOLICITY AND CATHOLICITY. It may of course be possible within the New Church to "love honor and serve" God, provided that one is truly unaware that the New Church has separated itself from the Church that Christ founded, just as it may be possible for Protestants who are "invincibly ignorant." It is not possible for anyone who is aware of all that is going on and who by staying in the New Church is doing so with the awareness and knowledge that it has changed the "Deposit of the Faith" and altered the rites established by Christ Himself. If however, we are to remain in different Churches, we can of course continue to love one another and to pray for one another. Please understand - such an attitude implies no judgment on each other's souls, for how can we know the degree of each other's "awareness and knowledge." And even if we are aware and knowing, one must remember that line of T. S. Eliot (an Anglican) "After such knowledge, what forgiveness!"

Finally, let me leave you with one last thought: In making a decision, it is not a question of being conservative verses being liberal. As St. Jerome puts it, "if you wander off the track a bit, it makes no difference whether you veer to the right or to the left: the important thing is that you are not on the right road." (Commentary on Matthew). It is really an issue of Orthodoxy verses Heterodoxy: nothing more and nothing less.

With love in the Divine Names of Jesus and Mary,

Sincerely